



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
07/867,851	4/16/92	Hori	501.20679 VC2

EXAMINER
----------

Baker, S.

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2306

25

DATE MAILED:

### EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Carl Brundidge (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) Stephen Baker (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of interview 10/19/94

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative). Fax copy to applicant

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement ☒ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☐ was not reached.

Claims discussed: All

Identification of prior art discussed: None

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant indicated an unwillingness to respond in writing to those portions of the office action mailed on 6/17/94 that were added to satisfy applicant's request to remedy the 'non-responsive' office action mailed on 5/13/94. Applicant indicated that the response filed on 6/8/94 ignored the rejection made under 35 USC 112, 2nd. par. because of the presence of a separate art-based rejection. The examiner noted that merely overcoming the rejection made under 35 USC 112, 2nd par. by deleting incorrect and incomprehensible language would not overcome the art-based rejection. The examiner suggested that applicant adopt the suggestions repeated in the office action mailed on 6/17/94 so that the claims may be allowed without further delays dictated by applicant.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
07/869,851	4/16/92	Hori	501.20699VC2

EXAMINER	
Baker, S.	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2306	26
DATE MAILED:	

### EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Carl Brundidge (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) Stephen Baker (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview 10/19/94

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative). Fax copy to applicant

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement ☒ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☐ was not reached.

Claims discussed: All

Identification of prior art discussed: None

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner re-iterated that adopting the suggestions repeated in the office action mailed on 6/17/94 would apparently place the application in allowable condition.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

- ☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.